

## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the interview on September 12, 2005. In the interview, independent claims 1, 10, 20, 32, 34, 39 and 43 were discussed. The art of record, primarily Cheng and Laurikka, was also discussed. Although no formal agreement was reached, it was generally agreed upon that the proposed limitation of claim 1 "said dynamic light effect significantly altering the surface appearance of said housing such that a significant portion of said housing itself and not said light system provides visual indication of the monitored events" would overcome the Cheng reference, and that the proposed limitation of claim 32 "the illumination colorizing the illuminable zones of the housing in conjunction with the color of the associated region of said extending the feel of said display screen," would overcome the Laurikka reference. In order to expedite prosecution, claims 1 and 32 have been amended to include the proposed limitations, and the remaining claims have been amended similarly but not exactly due to different language in the claims. Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20, 22-26, 28-33 under 35 USC 102 and claims 1-19, 21, 27, 34-54 under 35 USC 103. These rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 1, 2, 10, 13, 20, 32, 34, 39, 43, 49 and 50 have been amended. Claims 6, 15 and 55 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-54 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### ***Double Patenting***

A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith to overcome the non-statutory double patenting rejections.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102***

**Claims 1-19, 39-48 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Cheng* (6,492,908).**

In contrast to *Cheng*, claim 1 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...said dynamic light effect significantly altering the surface appearance of said housing such that a significant portion of the housing itself and not said light system provides visual indication of the monitored events." While *Cheng* may disclose a light transmittable case 110 and lights 150, *Cheng* does not teach or suggest altering the surface appearance of the light transmittable case 110. In *Cheng*, the lights provide direct visible indications through the light transmittable case, i.e., the light transmittable case is a window not a canvas. The lights simply do not alter the surface appearance of the light transmittable case. As stated in *Cheng*, "...it is an object of the present invention to provide a novel display configuration for directly showing the board level and component operational conditions and functional statuses. Light transmittable cases are employed and indication light signals for showing conditions and statuses are implemented such that a user is provided with more direct information related to the situations of the entire system (Col. 2, lines 14-21)." In essence, the lights of *Cheng* are very similar to standard indicators built into the surface of a housing. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Cheng*, claim 10 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...illuminating at least a significant portion of the housing of the general purpose computer system with the emitted light, the illumination colorizing or patterning the

surface appearance of the significant portion of the housing such that the significant portion of the housing itself and not the light system provides visual indication of the monitored computer system events.” No such feature is taught in *Cheng*. Again, *Cheng* does not change the appearance of the light transmittable case. In *Cheng* the light transmittable case is a window for viewing the lights disposed therein. The lights simply do not colorize or patternize a significant portion of the housing. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Cheng*, claim 39 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...determining illumination characteristics of the housing based on status information and predetermined configuration information...” Also in contrast to *Cheng*, claim 39 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...controlling the internal light elements using the driving signals, the internal light elements illuminating the housing when operational, the illumination significantly altering the surface appearance of the housing such that a significant portion of the housing itself and not the internal light elements provides visual indication of the status information of the monitored computer system components.” Because *Cheng* is silent to illuminating a housing, *Cheng* is also silent to determining illumination characteristics of the housing. The most that can be said is that *Cheng* may determine characteristics of the lights that can be seen through the light transmittable case. The light transmittable case is a window and therefore is NOT illuminated as in the present invention. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to *Cheng*, claim 43 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...said illumination significantly altering the surface appearance of said illuminable housing such that a significant portion of said illuminable housing itself and not said light arrangement provides visual indication of the computer event.” Again, *Cheng* does not change the appearance of the light transmittable case. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

**Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Laurikka et al* (6,508,996).**

In contrast to *Laurikka*, claim 20 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...sampling a plurality of regions of the screen display to acquire color indicators for the plurality of regions... changing the color of one or more regions of the housing based on the color indicators of one or more sampled regions of the screen display in order to extend the feel of the screen display to the housing that surrounds the screen display.” While *Laurikka* may disclose setting the color of the display to a different one, nowhere does *Laurikka* state that the color change of the cover is based on the current color of the display. This cannot be construed from Col. 6 lines 1-10. All that is stated in that paragraph is that the display, antenna and keyboard can change color by means of a control signal in a manner similar to the color change of the cover. *Laurikka* does not describe sampling the color of the display and changing the color of the cover based on the color of the display. Furthermore, *Laurikka* is completely silent to extending the feel of the display. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Figs 14-17 show several examples of sampling regions of a screen display and changing color of the housing based on the color of the screen display. Particularly, extending the feel of the display to the housing that surrounds the display. This simply is not taught in *Laurikka*.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103***

**Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Laurikka* in view of *Kawashima et al* (5,774,098).**

In contrast to both references, claim 32 specifically requires, “...illuminating the illuminable zones of the housing based on the color indicators of the regions associated therewith, the illumination being provided by light from the light element of the

particular illuminable zone, the illumination colorizing the illuminable zone of the housing in conjunction with the color of the associated region of said extending the feel of said display screen.” See above (claim 20). Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

**Claims 49-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cheng* in view of *Scheinberg* (6,030,088).**

*Scheinberg* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Cheng*. Neither reference discloses “...said illumination significantly altering the surface appearance of said illuminable housing such that a significant portion of said illuminable housing itself and not said light arrangement provides visual indication of the computer event,” as required by claim 43 from which these claims depend. In any event, it should be pointed out that *Scheinberg* discloses manually turning a neon light on and off via a switch 40. *Scheinberg* does not teach or suggest controlling the light in an adjustable manner or based on a computer event. The neon light only provides a fixed light output. It does not change, nor is it controllable once it turned on. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

**Claims 5, 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cheng* in view of *Welch* (5,938,772).**

*Welch* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Cheng*. Neither reference discloses the limitations of the independent claims as described above (claims 1 and 39).

**Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Laurikka* in view of *Kawashima et al* (5,774,098).**

*Kawashima* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Cheng*. Neither reference discloses the limitations of the independent claims as described above (claim 1).

**Claims 21-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Laurikka* in view of *Cheng*.**

*Cheng* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Laurikka*. Neither reference discloses the limitations “changing the color of one or more regions of the housing based on the color indicators of one or more sampled regions of the screen display in order to extend the feel of the screen display to the housing that surrounds the screen display as required by claim 20 from which claims 21-31 depend.

In contrast to both references, claim 32 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...associating regions of the display screen to particular illuminable zones; determining color indicators for a plurality of regions on the screen display that are associated with the illuminable zones; and illuminating the illuminable zones of the housing based on the color indicators of the regions associated therewith, the illumination being provided by light from the light element of the particular illuminable zone, the illumination colorizing the illuminable zone of the housing in conjunction with the color of the associated region of said extending the feel of said display screen.” Both references are completely silent to regional dependency or associating portions of a housing to portions of a display or extending the feel of a display screen. See also arguments made above regarding claim 20. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

**SUMMARY**

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Quin C. Hoellwarth  
Reg. No. 45,738

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300